

REMARKS

Page 35 has been amended to delete a reference to the attorney docket number in the heading to the page, and to add the phrase "what is claimed is" above claim 1.

Claims 1, 11 and 19 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. §102

MPEP 2131 quotes Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) for the legal standard of anticipation: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (emphasis added).

Claims 1-10

Claim 1 has been amended to claim a "system for performing anastomosis between a graft vessel and a target vessel, each having a lumen therethrough, where an opening is present in wall of the target vessel; the system comprising: an inner element connectable to the graft vessel, said inner element including a unitary body having a closed perimeter and an opening therethrough within said perimeter; wherein at least a portion of said unitary body is deformable from a first configuration to a second configuration and deformable back to said first configuration from said second configuration, wherein said second configuration allows at least a portion of said unitary body to enter the opening in the target vessel."

In contrast, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0153933 of Bolduc et. al. ("Bolduc") neither explicitly nor implicitly describes each and every element of amended claim 1. First, the Office Action identifies a hook 80 of Bolduc as corresponding to the claimed inner element. A plurality of hooks are utilized, and each one is "U-shaped." (e.g., Bolduc, paragraph 0065; Figures 18-19,24-30B) Thus, each inner element of Bolduc has an

open perimeter, instead of the closed perimeter claimed in amended claim 1. Second, amended claim 1 claims an "inner element including a unitary body." In contrast, Bolduc utilizes "a plurality of tissue securing members" to connect the graft vessel to the target vessel, where "the preferred tissue securing members comprise hooks 80." (e.g., Bolduc, paragraph 0065; Figures 18, 24) (emphasis added). Thus, Bolduc discloses a plurality of inner elements. Thus, Bolduc neither discloses nor suggests a unitary inner element as claimed in amended claim 1. Indeed, Bolduc teaches away from a unitary inner element by disclosing only a plurality of separate, discrete hooks 80.

Thus, Bolduc neither expressly nor inherently describes each and every element claimed in claim 1, and Applicants believe claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are thus believed to be in condition for allowance as well under MPEP 608.01(n)(III).

In addition, the inherency rejection with regard to claims 1-10 is unsupported. "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." MPEP 2112 (citing *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)) (emphasis in original). The Office Action merely states that "Bolduc et. al....is found to be inherently capable of performing the functions." (Office Action, page 3). No basis in fact or technical reasoning was set forth. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-10 on the grounds of inherency be withdrawn.

Claims 11-18

Claim 11 has been amended to claim a "system for performing anastomosis between a graft vessel and a target vessel, each having a lumen therethrough, where an opening is

present in the wall of the target vessel; the system comprising: a single elastically deformable inner element connectable to the graft vessel, said inner element deflectable from a first configuration to a second configuration and expandable from said second configuration to said first configuration, wherein said second configuration allows at least a portion of said inner element to enter the lumen of the target vessel through the opening; and an outer element connectable to said inner element to compress a portion of the graft vessel and a portion of the target vessel therebetween.”

In contrast, Bolduc neither explicitly nor implicitly describes each and every element of amended claim 11. The Office Action identifies a hook 80 of Bolduc as corresponding to the claimed inner element. Bolduc discloses “a plurality of tissue securing members,” where “the preferred tissue securing members comprise hooks 80.” (*e.g.*, Bolduc, paragraph 0065; Figures 18, 24) (emphasis added). Thus, Bolduc discloses a plurality of inner elements. In contrast, amended claim 11 claims “a single elastically deformable inner element.” Indeed, Bolduc teaches away from a single inner element by disclosing only a plurality of separate, discrete inner elements 80.

Thus, Bolduc neither expressly nor inherently describes each and every element claimed in claim 11, and Applicants believe claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Claims 12-18 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11, and are thus believed to be in condition for allowance as well under MPEP 608.01(n)(III).

In addition, the inherency rejection with regard to claims 1-10 is unsupported, as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-18 on the grounds of inherency be withdrawn.

Claims 19-25

Claim 19 has been amended to claim a "method for performing anastomosis between a graft vessel and a target vessel, each having a lumen therethrough, where an opening is present in the target vessel, comprising: providing an outer element and an inner element, said inner element including a unitary body having a closed perimeter and an opening therethrough within said perimeter; deforming at least a portion of said unitary body from an initial

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.